

many large employer plan sponsors have been forced to take contribution holidays, and thus have been prevented from funding toward projected actuarial liabilities—a more accurate measure of long-term pension plan costs than current liability. I believe it is time to reconsider the suitability of this artificial maximum contribution limit and ensure a more sound funding target—it is not the time to adopt a definition of excess assets based on the inadequate standard of current liabilities.

It may, indeed, be time to reconsider the suitability of this artificial maximum contribution limit and ensure a more sound funding target of at least “plan termination liability” which is the level of plan assets needed to pay all benefits upon the actual termination of a plan. Clearly, it could not have been intended that a large employer in or facing bankruptcy be enabled to extract assets from a pension plan and to then terminate the employer’s plan or plans, leaving other employers who pay PBGC premiums or taxpayers to pay for the pensions of the employer’s underfunded plan or plans. This can be avoided by listening to the voice of pension experts in the American Academy of Actuaries who suggest the withdrawal threshold be based on at least termination liability.

It also may well be that a more refined pension policy allowing for the reversion of pension assets that are truly excess could help restore employer interest in defined benefit plans and, thus, expand pension coverage. However, the provision should be crafted carefully, should amount to more than a temporary revenue raising measure, and should take into consideration the protections of that title I of Employer Retirement Income Security Act [ERISA] presently provides to plan participants and retirees. Without a permanent provision employers will have no incentive to create or remain in defined benefit plans—and that purported benefit of section 13607 will never be realized. Care must also be taken to recognize the complexity of individual plans, including the fact that so-called excess assets can arise from contributions made by employees as well as those made by employers.

Moreover, the reversion provisions of section 13607 may not even generate the revenue projected. Corporations with a tax loss

carry-forward will look to acquire companies with excess assets, so that they can take a reversion tax free. Alternatively, companies may wait to take reversions until they have a tax-loss year. Thus, we may be encouraging the removal of an estimated \$27 billion of excess assets without gaining the sought-after revenue.

The success of ERISA private pension plans in America has been immense—\$3.5 trillion of assets invested in America. In addition, unlike Social Security and many public pension plans, the assets are real. So far, ERISA’s “prudent man rule” has protected the sanctity of those trust funds. We have been successful in the House in fighting off the administration’s efforts to hawk economically targeted investments [ETI’s] to private pension plan fiduciaries. That effort could rightly be described as an attempt by the administration to force private pension assets to be used for socially correct investments. We want to allow employers the right to take true excess funds from their pension trusts, but the words “excess funds” are, at best, actuarial indefinite and vague. It is therefore essential that the formula for allowing employers to remove funds from pension trusts be unquestionably based on the most conservative of actuarial principles. I believe that this is the essence of what Republicans stand for. I fear, however, that section 13607 is not fully consistent with these principles.

Finally, I remain concerned that the reversion provisions in section 13607 do not include the ERISA amendments necessary to enable pension plan asset reversions to be legally consummated.

Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, although I have these concerns about the pension reversion provisions, this reconciliation bill has many more positives than negatives. And there still is opportunity—in conference—for salutary changes. What is most important is that the constant failure of Congress to reach a balanced budget is leading us to an unforgivable consequence: passing on trillions of dollars in Federal debt to future generations of Americans. The best time to begin putting matters in order is today; when it comes to making tough decisions to rein in total Federal spending, tomorrow never comes.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. BILBRAY].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. BILBRAY] is recognized for 40 seconds.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, I am a freshman. I have not been here before, but I do recognize the fact that the citizens of the United States want to get their fair share for their dollar spent.

The colleagues to my left keep pointing out about Medicare. My seniors are saying, why pay more than twice the rate of inflation? Any good consumer would not only encourage that, they would demand that. That is all we are saying.

Let me leave you with this: I keep hearing my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, who controlled this body for 40 years, saying that they support a balanced budget. As a freshman who has come here this year, my question to them is, why again and again ever since the 1960’s have they not been able to present that balanced budget to the people?

So all I ask them to do is quit finding excuses not to vote for a balanced budget. The American people want it. They are tired of the excuses from Washington, and they want us to prove that we can balance the budget just like they do every day of their lives.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 245, all time for general debate, has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of H.R. 2517, as modified by the amendments printed in House Report 104-292, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered as an original bill for the purpose of further amendment and is considered read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, is as follows:

## NOTICE

***Incomplete record of House proceedings. Except for concluding business which follows, today’s House proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.***

### CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1905, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. BUNN of Oregon submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 1905) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 104-293)

The Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1905) “making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending

September 30, 1996, and for other purposes,” having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 6, 18, 20, 23, 24, 26, 32, 36, 44, 45, 46, 47, 57, and 58.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 7, 13, 14, 25, 33, 38, 39, 40, 43, and 54; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$121,767,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment insert:

*Norco Bluffs, California, \$375,000;*

*Ohio River Greenway, Indiana, \$500,000;*

*Kentucky Lock and Dam, Kentucky, \$2,000,000;*

*Mussers Dam, Middle Creek, Snyder County, Pennsylvania, \$300,000; and*

*West Virginia Port Development, West Virginia, \$300,000: Provided, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to undertake a study of water supply and associated needs in the vicinity of Hazard, Kentucky, using \$500,000 of the funds*